UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/500,145	07/09/2004	Martin Volland	255259US0PCT	5229
22850 7590 09/03/2009 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER	
			NWAONICHA, CHUKWUMA O	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1621	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/03/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/500,145	VOLLAND ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	CHUKWUMA O. NWAONICHA	1621				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 Ju</u>	lv 2009.					
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>17-20 and 22-26</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>17-20, 22, and 24-26</u> is/are rejected.						
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>23</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
	·					
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	• •				

Application/Control Number: 10/500,145 Page 2

Art Unit: 1621

DETAILED ACTION

Current Status

1. Claims 17-20 and 22-26 are pending in the application.

- 2. This action is responsive to Applicants' amendment of 21 July 2009.
- 3. Receipt and entry of Applicants' amendment is acknowledged.
- 4. The 112 rejection has been withdrawn following Applicants amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 17-20, 22 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breikes et al., {US 5,710,344} in view of Yamamoto et al., {EP 1 142 898}.

Application/Control Number: 10/500,145 Page 3

Art Unit: 1621

Applicants claim a method for the synthesis of phosphorus compounds; wherein all the other variables are as defined in the claims.

<u>Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (M.P.E.P. §2141.01)</u>

Breikes et al. teach a process for the production of phosphorus compounds with in the presence of an amine to form a salt and the desired product, which was filtered to separate the salt. The reaction was conducted at –78°C at a reduced pressure.

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims (M.P.E.P.. §2141.02)

Breikes et al. process for preparing phosphorus compounds differs from the instantly claimed process in that applicants' claim a process that makes phosphorus compounds at 30C 190°C while Breikes et al. teach a process conducted at a lower temperature. Another difference between applicants claimed invention and the prior art of Breikes et al. is that Applicants claim a process that employs cyclic amines base with melting point less than 160°C while the prior art employed triethylamine base with boiling point 89.7°C.

However, the secondary teach a process for the preparation of phosphorus compounds in the presence of cyclic amine compounds at a temperature of -5°C - 150°C. See sections 0009-0018. The cyclic amine compounds are used to remove the acid generated during the reaction.

Finding of prima facie obviousness--rational and motivation (M.P.E.P.. §2142-2143)

The instantly claimed process for preparing phosphorus compounds would have been suggested to one of ordinary skill because one of ordinary skill wishing to obtain phosphorus compounds is taught to employ the process of Breikes et al. and Yamamoto et al.,

Page 4

One of ordinary skill in the art would have a reasonable expectation of success in practicing the instant invention by varying the amine base, the temperature and pressure from the teaching of Breikes et al. to arrive at the instantly claimed process for preparing phosphorus compounds. Said person would have been motivated to practice the teaching of the reference cited because phosphorus compounds are useful in industrial applications as ligands. The Examiner notes that varying the pressure, temperature, catalyst or reactants in a chemical reaction is a well-known chemical practice to optimize the process efficiency of the system and does not constitute a patentable distinction absent a showing of criticality. Additionally, merely modifying the process conditions such as temperature and concentration is not a patentable modification absent a showing of criticality. In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 105 U. S. P. Q. 233 (C. C. P. A. 1955). Therefore, the instantly claimed invention would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 23 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/500,145 Page 5

Art Unit: 1621

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chukwuma O. Nwaonicha whose telephone number is 571-272-2908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Sullivan can be reached on 571-272-0779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Chukwuma O. Nwaonicha/ Examiner, Art Unit 1621

/Daniel M Sullivan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1621